

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/664,004	09/16/2003	David H. Burkett	ACS 62622 (3714P)	3904	
24201 FULWIDER P	7590 09/13/2007 ATTON LLP		EXAMINER		
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER 6060 CENTER DRIVE, TENTH FLOOR			WACHTEL, EMILY L		
LOS ANGELE	•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3709		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/13/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Щ		٠.
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/664,004	BURKETT ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Emily Wachtel	3709	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	opears on the cover sheet	t with the correspondence addr	ess
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IT - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMU .136(a). In no event, however, mand will apply and will expire SIX (6) Note, cause the application to become	NICATION. y a reply be timely filed MONTHS from the mailing date of this come e ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status	•		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
	is action is non-final.	•	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	ance except for formal m	•	nerits is
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 (J.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	·	•	
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•	·	
8) Claim(s) 1-30 are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.	•	
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner		•
	ccepted or b) objected	to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre			1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	·	•	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			•
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C). § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
1. Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documer		n Application No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri	iority documents have be	en received in this National S	tage
application from the International Bure	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies r	not received.	
	* •		
AMa-h			
Attachment(s)	A) 🗖 1=45==35		
1)		ew Summary (PTO-413) No(s)/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice	of Informal Patent Application	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) L_J Other:		

Application/Control Number: 10/664,004 Page 2

Art Unit: 3709

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-19, drawn to a guide wire classified in class 604 subclass 164.130.

II. Claims 20-30 drawn to a method for providing a guide wire classified in class

264, subclass 167.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product can be made by a materially different process such as coating an elongated core through

a bath of melted thermoplastic polymer then texturing the thermoplastic coated core.

3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and

there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the

inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification,

restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Application/Control Number: 10/664,004 Page 3

Art Unit: 3709

4. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

SET I:

Species A a guide wire shown in Figures 5-6

Species B a guide wire shown in Figures 7-8

Species C a guide wire shown in Figures 9-10 and 16

Species D a guide wire shown in Figures 11-12

Species E a guide wire shown in Figure 13

Species F a guide wire shown in Figure 14

Species G a guide wire shown in figure 15

SET II:

Species X a guide wire with a constant outer diameter shown in Figure 19

Species Y a guide wire with a non-constant outer diameter shown in Figure 5

The species in SET I and SET II are independent or distinct because the species in SET I and SET II are mutually exclusive from each other. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed are not capable of use together and have materially different designs. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Art Unit: 3709

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species from each of the two sets of species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claims are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

5. A telephone call was made to Paul Feng on August 20, 2007 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Art Unit: 3709

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emily Wachtel whose telephone number is (571) 270-3648. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sam Yao can be reached on (571) 272-1224. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/664,004

Art Unit: 3709

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

> Emily Wachtel Patent Examiner Art Unit 3709

Emilianta